

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 7, 9-12, and 14-16 are currently pending. Claims 1-6, 8, 13, 17 and 18 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 7 and 12, which are independent, are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at pages 15-19. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 7 and 12 have been amended thereby obviating the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections. Applicants submit that a service list descriptor is used for the second and later descriptors repeated in accordance with the TS descriptor length. This descriptor also indicates ID of a service (channel) multi-layered on the stream (or transponder in this case). That is, a plurality of service list descriptors are appended to one TS ID. (See Specification, pages 15-19.)

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 9-11, 12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,970,386 to Williams (hereinafter, merely “Williams”) in view of “DVB Document A038: Specification for service information (SI) in Digital Video Broadcasting (DVB) Systems” (hereinafter, merely “DVB”)¹.

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*:

“An information transmission apparatus...

wherein service identifiers of network information that are not retransmitted are deleted and placeholder data for the deleted service identifiers is added, and

wherein a service list descriptor is **repeatedly appended to a transport stream identifier in accordance with the length of a transport stream for identifying a new or previous transmission.**” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Williams relates to a system for redistributing a broadband audio-visual-data signal to multiple receiver units within a multiple dwelling unit. A main receiving antenna receives a broadband video/audio/data signal having a number of individual program multiplex signals therein and a transmodulator device that transmodulates the individual program multiplex signals associated with the broadband signal. The transmodulated signals are broadcast over a network to individual receiver units which demodulate the transmodulated signals.

As understood by Applicants, DVB relates to Service Information (SI) data which forms a part of DVB bit streams in order to assist in selection of services and/or events within the bitstream so that an Integrated Receiver Decoder (IRD) can configure itself for the selected services.

¹ On pages 3-4 of the Office Action, DVB incorporates by reference “ETR 211: Digital Video Broadcasting: Guidelines on Implementation and Usage of Service Information” (hereinafter, merely “ETR 211”).

Applicants submit that Williams and DVB, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above features of claim 7. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion of an information transmission apparatus wherein a service list descriptor is repeatedly appended to a transport stream identifier in accordance with the length of a transport stream for identifying a new or previous transmission, as recited in claim 7.

Indeed, Applicants submit that section 6.2.28 and 6.2.29 of DVB, which states, “[t]he stream identifier descriptor... label component streams of a service so that they can be differentiated, e.g. by text descriptions given in component descriptors in the EIT if present...stuffing descriptor provides a means of invalidating previously coded descriptors or inserting dummy descriptors for table stuffing” and clause 4.1.1 of ETR 211, which states, “...actual delivery system is valid if and only if it contains applicable delivery system descriptors... when a service (contained inside a TS) is transferred to another delivery system, only the network_id changes, whereas the original_network_id remains unaffected”, provides no teaching or suggestion of a service list descriptor being repeatedly appended to a transport stream identifier in accordance with the length of a transport stream for identifying a new or previous transmission. Furthermore, DVB, in table 65 on page 55, provides a set amount of bits for three types of tags per stream identifier descriptor. Applicants submit that DVB has no disclosure of appending descriptors to a stream identifier to identify a transmission accordingly.

None of the other references cited provide the disclosure of claim 7.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 7 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 7, amended independent claim 12 is also believed to be patentable.

Therefore, independent claims 7 and 12 are patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portion or portions of the reference or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By



Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800